



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,300	03/29/2001	Eric Koenig	MULTI-TASK- CELL PHONE	6848
4988	7590	01/23/2006	EXAMINER ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I	
ALFRED M. WALKER 225 OLD COUNTRY ROAD MELVILLE, NY 11747-2712			ART UNIT 2677	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,300

Applicant(s)

KOENIG

Examiner

Abbas I. Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7,10-13,16,17 and 19-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7,10-13,16,17 and 19-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/23/05 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references, Lebby et al. and Ryuji alone or in combination do not teach a newly amended claim limitation stating as “at least one additional screen slidable outward axially along the side to side axis of the first screen “.

However as shown in the art rejection below, Ryuji teaches a multi-screen display device (100) including a display unit (20) that is moved to freely slide in a lateral direction on the upper surface of the display unit (10) arranged under the display unit (20) by rotating the mechanisms 21a, 21b and 21c (see the abstract, the last sentence and Fig. 1 (100, 20, 10)). In response to applicant's argument that Ryuji's display instead slides perpendicular to the axis of the screen component and it slides inward, the examiner maintains that different sliding angles and directions with respect to the sliding display are obvious choice in design (also see In re Stevens, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954)). Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have ascertained that Ryuji's slidable display could be made in various orientations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 10-13, 16-17 and 19-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebby et al. (US Patent 6158884) in view of Ryuji (Japanese Publication # 11-095318).

As to claims 7, 28 and 34, Lebby et al. teaches a handheld wireless telecommunications unit displaying images to a user (integrated communicative watch as portable electronic equipment, column 1, lines 1-9, cellular phone, column 6, lines 58-62) comprising: a hand-held body having a keypad (wristband 26 with numeric keypad 28 as shown in figure 1 A); a display on an upper face of said body comprising a first screen having a side to side axis (watch face 14 shown in figure 1A, column 3, lines 31-33)

Lebby does not teach “at least one additional screen slidable outward axially along the side to side axis of the first screen along tracks mounted on respective opposite edges of said first screen, said at least one additional screen being movable between a first position, wherein the at least one additional screen is stored under said first screen and a second deployed position wherein said at least one additional screen extends outward and forms a continuous screen with

Art Unit: 2677

said first screen; and grasping handle extending from a distal edge of said at least one additional screen accessible when said at least one additional screen is stored under said first screen for pulling said at least one additional screen from said first position to said second deployed position”.

Ryuji on the other hand teaches a multi-screen display device (100) including a display unit (20) that is moved to freely slide in a lateral direction on the upper surface of the display unit (10) arranged under the display unit (20) by rotating the mechanisms 21a, 21b and 21c (see the abstract, the last sentence and Fig. 1 (100, 20, 10)).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display system of a communicative watch shown in Fig. 1A to adapt a sliding movable display (20) as well as rotating mechanisms (21a, 21b 21c) as configured in Fig. 1 because the sliding movable display along with rotating mechanisms helps function a multi-screen display system as taught by Ryuji.

As to claims 10 and 30, Ryuji teaches said telecommunications unit is a cellular telephone (Fig. 1 (100), it would have been obvious that the multi-screen display (100) could be used in any display device).

As to claims 11 and 31, Ryuji teaches said telecommunications unit is a wireless personal digital assistant (Fig. 1 (100), it would have been obvious that the multi-screen display (100) could be used in any display device).

As to claims 12 and 32, Ryuji teaches telecommunications unit is wireless Internet Web based personal electronic organizer (Fig. 1 (100), it would have been obvious that the multi-screen display (100) could be used in any display device).

As to claims 13 and 33, Lebby et al. teach said screens are LCD's (Lebby et al., liquid crystal display, column 5, lines 62-63).

As to claim 16, Lebby et al. teach said at least one slidably attached screen is comprises at least one screen attached to a left side of said first screen (Lebby et al. display 27 is slidably attached to wrist face shown in figure 1 A).

As to claim 17, Lebby et al. teach said slidably attached screen is attached to a right side of said first screen (Lebby et al. display 27 is slidably attached to wrist face shown in figure 1 A).

As to claim 19, Lebby et al. teach at least one additional screen is coplanar with said first screen when said at least one additional screen is deployed. (Lebby et al. display 27 is coplanar with wrist face shown in figure 1A).

As to claim 20, Lebby et al. teach said first screen is powered by a first driver electronics circuitry controlled by imaging software and said at least one additional screen is powered by a separate driver electronics circuitry controlled by imaging software (see power source, Fig. 2).

As to claim 21, Lebby et al teach said first and said at least one additional screens are both powered by a common driver electronics circuitry controlled by imaging software (see power source, Fig. 2).

As to claim 22, Lebby et al. teach said first screen displays a first image powered by a first driver electronics circuitry controlled by imaging software and said alt least one additional

screen displays a second image powered by a second driver electronics circuitry controlled by imaging software (see power source, Fig. 2).

As to claim 23, Ryuji teaches said first and at least one additional screens display respective portions of a single image (see the abstract, display screens, 20, 30, 40).

As to claim 24, Ryuji teaches said opposite edges of said first screen are respective upper and lower edges of said first screen (see the abstract, display screens, 20, 30, 40).

As to claim 25, Ryuji teaches said at least one additional screen comprises a plurality of screens (see the abstract, display screens, 20, 30, 40).

As to claim 26, Ryuji teaches said at least one additional screen comprises at least one screen attaches to a left side of said first screen and at least one screen attached to a right side of said first screen (see the abstract, display screens, 20, 30, 40).

As to claim 27, Ryuji teaches said at least one additional screen comprises a plurality of screens attached to a right side of said first screen (see the abstract, display screens, 20, 30, 40).

S to claim 29, Ryuji teaches a grasping handle extending from a distal edge of said third screen accessible when said second and said at least one further screens are nested under said first screen for pulling said second and said at least one further screens outwardly to from said continuous screen (see the abstract. It would be obvious and is a matter of design choice to determine how the rotating the mechanisms 21a, 21b and 21c are grasped).

Art Unit: 2677

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abbas I. Abdulsalam whose telephone number is (571) 272-7685. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2677

January 11, 2006

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amr A. Awad', written over a horizontal line.